



County of Santa Cruz

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 410, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4070
(831) 454-2160 FAX (831) 454-2385 TDD (831) 454-2123

THOMAS L. BOLICH
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

December 14, 2004

ROSARIO MARIN, CHAIR
California Integrated Waste Management Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812-2815

SUBJECT: SANTA CRUZ COUNTY FIVE-YEAR PLAN REVIEW REPORT

Dear Ms. Marin:

The purpose of this letter is to convey, in accordance with California Code of Regulations Section 18788, comments from the Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (Local Task Force) regarding the adequacy of the Santa Cruz County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (Plan) and the need for any revision to the Plan.

On December 2, 2004, the Local Task Force commented that no revisions to the Plan were required at this time and voted to approve the draft Five-Year Plan Review Report as presented.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Dan deGrassi, staff to the Local Task Force, at the Santa Cruz County Department of Public Works, 831-454-3102.

Yours truly,

Scott Hamby, Chair
Santa Cruz County Integrated
Waste Management Local Task Force

RPM:mh

Copy to: Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force
Terry Edwards, California Integrated Waste Management Board

5yrplanmh

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE YEAR REVIEW REPORT

DECEMBER 10, 2004

PREPARED BY
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Description	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Background	5
3	Local Task Force Review	6
4	Issues Analysis	7
5	Summary of Findings	16
6	Supplementary Information	17

SECTION 1 **INTRODUCTION**

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939) requires cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills and transformed by 25% by 1995; by 50% by the year 2000 through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) is the guiding document for attaining these goals.

The California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or the CIWMP at least once every five years to:

- (1) Correct any deficiencies in the element or plan;
- (2) Comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under PRC Section 41780; and
- (3) Revise the documents, as necessary.

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 states that prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of the CIWMP, the Local Task Force (LTF) shall complete a review of the CIWMP to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

- (1) Source reduction;
- (2) Recycling and composting;
- (3) Environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal.

The process identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- ☐ Prior to the 5th anniversary, the LTF shall submit *written comments* on areas of the CIWMP, which require revision to the county and the Board;
- ☐ Within 45 days of receipt of comments, the county shall determine if a revision is necessary and notify the LTF and the Board of its findings in a *CIWMP Review Report*; and
- ☐ within 90 days of receipt of the *CIWMP Review Report*, the Board shall review the county's findings and, at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's findings.

CCR 18788 also identifies the minimum issues, which are to be addressed in the *CIWMP Review Report*. They are:

- (A) Changes in demographics in the county;
- (B) Changes in quantities of the waste within the county;

- (C) Changes in funding sources for administration of the countywide siting element and summary plan;
- (D) Changes in administrative responsibilities;
- (E) Program implementation status;
- (F) Changes in permitted disposal capacity and quantities of waste disposed of in the County;
- (G) Changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and
- (H) Changes in the implementation schedule.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) clarified the five-year CIWMP review process in CCR Section 18788. On October 30, 1998 and again on July 21, 2000, the CIWMB Office of Local Assistance sent letters to jurisdictions clarifying the Board's oversight of the five year revision process. A copy of CCR Section 18788 is included in Section 6 of this *CIWMP Review Report*.

The July 21st letter stated that the five year anniversary is from the date of final approval by the Board of the CIWMP; that the Board Legal staff determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to update program information, if a revision is not determined by the jurisdiction to be necessary; and that if a revision is determined to be necessary, it may be submitted with the next annual report.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

CCR	California Code of Regulations
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CIWMP	Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CSE	Countywide Siting Element
HHWE	Household Hazardous Waste Element
LTF	Local Task Force
NDFE	Non-Disposal Facility Element
PARIS	Planning and Annual Report Information System
PRC	Public Resources Code
SP	Summary Plan
SRRE	Source Reduction and Recycling Element

SECTION 2 **BACKGROUND**

The Santa Cruz County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan contains solid waste planning documents for the County of Santa Cruz and the incorporated cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley and Watsonville.

These documents include:

- ☐ Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) for each city and the county named above;
- ☐ Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs) for each city and the county named above.
- ☐ The Non-disposal Facility Elements (NDFE) for each city and the county named above.
- ☐ Countywide Siting Element (CSE)
- ☐ Summary Plan (SP)

The California Integrated Waste Management Board gave final approval for the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan for the County of Santa Cruz and its cities in March 1999. This is the county's first 5-Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

The purpose of this ***CIWMP Review Report*** therefore is to document the compliance of PRC 41822 and CCR 18788 by Santa Cruz County and its four cities.

Each jurisdiction in the county- the City of Capitola, City of Santa Cruz, City of Scotts Valley, City of Watsonville and Unincorporated County of Santa Cruz, has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. No petition for a reduction in to the 50% requirement or time extension has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.

SECTION 3**LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW**

The Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:

Name (Rep. / Alt.)	Representative Of (e.g., City or County)
Sheryl Ainsworth / Scott Hamby	City of Scotts Valley
Richard De La Paz / Robert Ketley	City of Watsonville
Stephanie Harlan / Lisa Murphy	City of Capitola
David Koch / Nancy Lockwood	City of Watsonville
Bob Nelson / Mary Arman	City of Santa Cruz
Ellen Pirie / Robin Musitelli	County of Santa Cruz
Norm Ploss / Michael Bethke	County of Santa Cruz
Michael Rotkin / Alan Schlenger	City of Santa Cruz
Mardi Wormhoudt / Andy Schiffrin	County of Santa Cruz

In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP and finalized its comments at the December 2, 2004 LTF meeting.

The Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force had no comments on the CIWMP other than to conclude that no revision was necessary. The Task Force took action to approve the draft Plan Review Report as presented.

The county received these comments from the LTF on December 2, 2004, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the 5-Year CIWMP Review Report to the CIWMB and the LTF.

SECTION 4**ISSUES ANALYSIS**

This section addresses not only the areas of change specified in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 (3) (A) through (H), but also provide specific analysis regarding the continued adequacy the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County

The following tables document the demographic changes in the county since 1990. The analysis addresses the adequacy of the planning documents in light of these changes and the need, if any, for revision.

As can be seen from Table 1, the residential/non-residential generation percentages have not changed significantly since the preparation of the planning documents. Figures in the "Old" column reflect 1990 and those in the "New" column, the year 2000.

Table 1. Sources of Generation

JURISDICTION	RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE		NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE	
	OLD	NEW	OLD	NEW
City of Capitola	n/a	41	n/a	59
City of Santa Cruz	46	52	54	48
City of Scotts Valley	15	15	85	85
City of Watsonville	39	39	61	61
Unincorporated County	34	38	66	62

Sources: CIWMB, <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/JurDrSta.asp?VW=In> (Report Years: 1995, 1998, 2002)

Table 2 on the following page shows population growth for the ten-year period from 1990 to 2000. Each jurisdiction has kept pace with its population growth through expansion of solid waste management services, including recycling and other diversion programs. Employment, taxable sales and the CPI increases reflect the "dot com" boom of the late 1990s (which crashed shortly thereafter). These changes have been accounted for in the CIWMB adjustment methodology utilized to calculate the individual diversion rates.

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005**Table 2. Demographics**

POPULATION			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Change
City of Capitola Population	10,171	10,033	-1.4
City of Santa Cruz Population	49,040	54,593	11.3
City of Scotts Valley Population	8,615	11,385	32.2
City of Watsonville Population	31,099	44,265	42.3
Unincorporated County Population	130,809	135,326	3.5
Countywide Population	229,734	255,602	11.3

EMPLOYMENT			
Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Change
Countywide Employment	126,800	135,100	6.5

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS			
Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% Change
City of Capitola Taxable Sales	303,753	463,310	52.5
City of Santa Cruz Taxable Sales	480,315	828,500	72.5
City of Scotts Valley Taxable Sales	138,614	184,736	33.3
City of Watsonville Taxable Sales	284,337	445,077	56.5
Unincorporated County Taxable Sales	442,424	706,494	59.7
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	1,649,443	2,628,117	59.3

Consumer Price Index			
Statewide Consumer Price Index	1990	2000	% Change
	135	174.8	29.5

Source: CIWMB Default Adjustment Factors
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp>

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005

Table 3 below shows changes in the number of dwelling units in the various jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County from 1990 to 2000. Scotts Valley showed the largest increase in single family homes for this period, followed by Watsonville. Capitola and the Unincorporated County showed a decline in the number of multi-family dwellings while the other three jurisdictions had a modest increase in such units.

Table 3. Dwelling Information

Jurisdiction	1990 Single Family Dwellings	2000 Single Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Multi- Family Dwellings	2000 Multi- Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Mobile Homes	2000 Mobile Homes	% Change
Capitola	2282	2246	-1.6	2229	2213	-0.7	771	650	-15.7
Santa Cruz	12,718	14,008	10.1	6240	7056	13.1	406	440	8.4
Scotts Valley	2100	2831	34.8	675	788	16.7	797	804	0.9
Watsonville	6320	7524	19.1	2832	3293	16.3	757	872	15.2
Uninc County	42,272	44,686	5.7	7053	6776	-3.9	4426	4486	1.4

Source: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5.xls>;
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5a.xls>

Analysis

These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

The increases in population and housing naturally result in additional generation of solid waste. Diversion programs of all five jurisdictions have been able to expand to meet this growth. Disposal facilities have adequate capacity to accommodate materials destined for landfill disposal. These increases and their resulting impacts on the solid waste management systems described in the CIWMP have been entirely manageable and the Plan remains adequate in its documentation of the waste management strategies used in Santa Cruz County.

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County

1. *Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County (as it relates to diversion program implementation)*

The data below document changes in reported disposal compared to original Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) projections. Additionally, the Biennial Review findings for each jurisdiction are provided in Table 6 below to demonstrate progress in implementing the SRRE and achieving diversion mandates. The analysis at the end of this section addresses how these changes are being addressed (e.g., how existing, new or planned programs deal with the reported changes in the quantities of waste) relative to the jurisdictions' ability to meet and maintain the diversion goal and the need, if any, for a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Generation

The table below shows the average amount of waste generated within Santa Cruz County described in terms of pounds per person per day.

Table 4. Per Capita Generation

	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Capitola	11.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.0	12.3	12.2	11.9
Santa Cruz	12.5	11.7	11.9	12.3	12.4	12.8	13.5	13.3	12.6
Scotts Valley	18.7	17.4	17.0	16.1	16.1	16.2	16.8	16.8	16.1
Watsonville	9.2	6.6	6.2	7.6	7.5	15.0	14.6	15.2	15.0
Uninc. County	8.7	5.3	5.4	5.6	5.7	8.5	8.9	8.9	8.6
Countywide	10.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.0	11.4	11.5	11.1
Statewide	9.3	8.6	8.8	8.9	9.4	9.9	10.7	10.8	11.2

Sources: *CIWMB Board Approved Diversion Rate Reports; Department of Finance Population Reports*. Figures for Capitola for the years 1995-1998 are not available from that source.

By and large, generation rates have remained steady over this twelve-year period with Watsonville and the County showing increases in the late 1990s, reflecting the economic growth at that time. The Countywide average has also remained more or less aligned with the statewide average over the period.

Disposal

The following table provides disposal data for the county from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction's Annual Reports (1995 through 2002). The 1990 figures for Capitola and Scotts Valley may not be accurate as there was some question about the origin studies conducted at the time. Neither city undertook major diversion programs between 1990 and 1995 that resulted in a fifty percent plus reduction in their waste stream.

Table 5. Disposal Totals (Tons)

Year	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Capitola	31,384	14,801	12,325	12,018	11,554	12,304	11,753	11,031	10,842
Santa Cruz	77,069	72,076	72,546	75,604	71,549	69,477	81,106	70,791	60,922
Scotts Valley	28,260	14,033	12,284	11,549	14,609	13,764	12,691	11,536	11,836
Watsonville	40,940	33,648	33,756	34,068	39,642	40,269	42,423	36,761	36,097
Uninc. County	111,087	101,799	105,544	106,945	112,603	113,109	121,726	116,836	120,810
Countywide	288,740	236,357	236,455	240,184	249,957	249,923	269,699	246,955	240,507

Sources: *CIWMB Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility*

<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin*

Detail at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>

Table 6. Comparison of SRRE-2000 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2000 Disposal Totals

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the actual 2000 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	SRRE 2000 Projected	Disposal 2000 Reported	% Difference
City of Capitola	19,537	11,753	-39.8
City of Santa Cruz	60,843	81,106	33.3
City of Scotts Valley	13,558	12,691	-6.4
City of Watsonville	24,742	42,423	71.5
Unincorporated County	36,146	121,726	236.8
Countywide	154,826	269,699	74.2

Sources: *CIWMB Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility*

<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin*

Detail <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>

The cities of Capitola and Scotts Valley show a lower actual disposal quantity for 2000 than was projected in 1990 by their Source Reduction and Recycling Elements. The other three jurisdictions show a higher quantity. There are several reasons for these latter differences. First, the SRRE projections were based on diversion program performance which in some cases assumed very optimistic diversion amounts. Source reduction is one general example. Second, some programs for various reasons were not implemented, or started later than anticipated and these changes have been reflected in the Annual Reports. The most significant case is the Unincorporated County, the SRRE for which identified a four-sort recycling/composting program that was to yield an 84% diversion rate. This program, whose assumed level of diversion was questioned from the start, was

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005

not implemented due to cost. A number of other diversion programs were put into effect instead and these have yielded over a fifty percent diversion rate for the County. The same circumstances, in general, apply to the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville. What is more important than the numbers themselves is the fact that none of the jurisdictions have had to deviate in any major way from their planned use of disposal or diversion facilities or strategies and all have successfully reached the 2000 diversion mandate.

Diversion

The Biennial Review findings for the county and associated cities are listed in Table 7 to demonstrate each jurisdiction's progress in implementing its SRRE and achieving the mandated diversion requirements. Additionally, following these data is an explanation of any significant changes in diversion rate trends (e.g., report year tonnage modification, new or corrected Solid Waste Generation Study, newly implemented programs).

Table 7. Biennial Review Data for Santa Cruz County Jurisdictions (1990 to 2002)

		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Capitola	Diversion Rate	No Rate	No Rate	No Rate	No Rate	44%	48%	51%	51%
	Biennial Review Status	Compliance Fulfilled	Compliance Fulfilled	Board Accepted	Board Accepted	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Approved	Board Approved
Santa Cruz	Diversion Rate	35%	36%	36%	41%	47%	48%	48%	52%
	Biennial Review Status	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Approved	Board Approved
Scotts Valley	Diversion Rate	59%	62%	64%	55%	59%	64%	67%	65%
	Biennial Review Status	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved
Watsonville	Diversion Rate	25%	26%	35%	32%	67%	66%	72%	72%
	Biennial Review Status	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Accepted	Board Accepted	Board Approved with New Base Year	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved
Uninc. County	Diversion Rate	21%	20%	21%	19%	46%	50%	55%	51%
	Biennial Review Status	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Approved Good Faith Effort	Board Accepted	Board Accepted	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved	Board Approved

Source: *CIWMB Countywide, Regionwide and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report* ; <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp>

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005

While not noted in the above CIWMB database, the City of Capitola and the County of Santa Cruz each had a New Base Year approved by the CIWMB in 1999. In both cases, and as with the City of Watsonville also, these jurisdictions documented existing additional diversion that was not identified in the original waste generation studies prepared in 1990. As of 2002, all five jurisdictions are exceeding the state 50% disposal reduction mandate.

A review of the preceding waste generation, disposal and diversion data indicates that the changes in quantities of waste, as they relate to meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The diversion facilities identified in each jurisdiction's Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) and in subsequent Annual Reports and NDFE amendments are adequate to meet the changing and increasing quantities of waste generated in the county.

At the time of the preparation of this Five-Year Plan Review Report, the County of Santa Cruz is preparing an amendment to its Non-Disposal Facility Element to identify two yard waste/wood waste chipping and grinding facilities, a Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Facility and a Research Compost Operation, all of which contribute to the County's diversion strategy.

2. Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

The following addresses whether changes in permitted disposal capacity and waste quantities (both imported from out of county and generated in the county) affect the county's ability to maintain 15 years of disposal capacity and includes a determination regarding the need for planning document revision.

Despite the inaccuracy of the SRRE based disposal projections, more than 15 years of countywide disposal capacity remains. This is documented in Table 8., below. Nonetheless, in compliance with the Countywide CIWMP, the county and four cities have initiated a study to identify future disposal or other solid waste management options. This study includes examination of the potential for a new landfill to serve all five jurisdictions, the potential for non-disposal alternatives such as waste-to-energy or conversion technologies and the potential for export of local waste out of the county and/or out of the state. This study will likely be completed in three or four years at which time any related NDFE or Countywide Siting Element amendment would be initiated. Until such time, the Countywide Siting Element remains accurate and adequate in describing needed disposal facilities.

Table 8. Remaining Disposal Capacity - Santa Cruz County Landfills

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY PERMITTED LANDFILL DISPOSAL					
	Estimated Closure Year (1)	Maximum Permitted Tonnage 2003 tpd	Actual Tonnage 2003 tpd	Remaining Capacity (yr) (1) mcy	Remaining Capacity 2004 mcy
COUNTY	2019	759	384	6.3 (1999)	4.0
SANTA CRUZ	2037	535	156	6.2 (2003)	6.0
WATSONVILLE	2029	275	97	2.1 (2000)	2.0
tpd = tons per day mcy = million cubic yards 1200 lbs/cy					
Sources: CIWMB Solid Waste Facility Permits (1); Disposal Reporting System; Individual Jurisdiction Landfill Airspace Calculations					

Tables 9 and 10 on the following pages provide a snapshot summary of solid waste management activity for Santa Cruz County for 2002 and 2003, the most recent years for which the respective CIWMB data is available. Table 9 shows the nature of the solid waste disposal activity in 2003 for solid waste generated by each of the five jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County. This table shows where that solid waste went for its final resting place. This includes both landfills within the county and out-of-county landfills. It should be noted that the accuracy of some of the numbers for out-of-county landfills are being questioned. Table 10 provides a summary of generation, diversion, disposal quantities for the year 2002 for each of the five jurisdictions in the county. On a countywide basis, for every two tons of solid waste disposed in a landfill, almost three tons were diverted.

TABLE 9. 2003 DISPOSAL - SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

(All figures in tons)

	SANTA CRUZ	CAPITOLA	COUNTY	SCOTTS VALLEY	WATSONVILLE	COUNTYWIDE
TOTAL	64,618	11,229	115,899	12,923	37,504	242,173
TPD (365)	177	31	318	35	103	663
% of countywide total	27%	5%	48%	5%	15%	100%

USE OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY LANDFILLS BY JURISDICTION

LOCAL DISPOSAL ONLY (does not include refuse received from out-of-county)

Facility Name						Landfill Total
COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ LANDFILL	7083	1862	114,996	11,808	1530	137,279
% of landfill total	5.2	1.4	83.8	8.6	1.1	
CITY OF SANTA CRUZ LANDFILL	56,385	0	33	0	0	56,418
% of landfill total	99.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	
CITY OF WATSONVILLE LANDFILL	0	0	0	0	35,133	35,133
% of landfill total	0	0	0	0	100	

USE OF OUT-OF COUNTY LANDFILLS BY JURISDICTION

						Countywide
tons sent out-of-county	1150	9366	870	1114	842	13,342
% of jurisdiction total disposal	2	83	1	9	2	6

DISPOSAL IN ALL LANDFILLS including OUT-OF-COUNTY

Facility Name (County)						Countywide Total Disposal
ALTAMONT LANDFILL - RESOURCE RECV'RY (Alameda)	5	6		0	235	246
ARVIN SANITARY LANDFILL (Kern)	12			2		14
AZUSA LAND RECLAMATION CO, INC (Los Angeles)	130	14	22		14	180
B - J DROPBOX SANITARY LANDFILL (Solano)		4	35		3	42
BAKERSFIELD S.L.F. (BENA) (Kern)	7			1		8
BUENA VISTA DRIVE SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Cruz)	7,083	1,862	114,996	11,808	1,530	137,279
CITY OF SANTA CRUZ SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Cruz)	56,385		33			56,418
CITY OF WATSONVILLE LANDFILL (Santa Cruz)					35,133	35,133
CRAZY HORSE SANITARY LANDFILL (Monterey)			27		120	147
CWMI - B18 Nonhazardous Codisposal (Kings Waste and Recycling Authority)	3				2	5
FORWARD, INC (San Joaquin)	18				5	23
GUADALUPE SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara)	5			62		67
JOHN SMITH Road Landfill (San Benito County Int Waste Mgmt Regional Agency)			2			2
MONTEREY REGIONAL WST MGMT DST/MARINA LF (Monterey)	775	9,342	777	1,046	459	12,399
NEWBY ISLAND SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara)	51				4	55
OX MOUNTAIN SANITARY LANDFILL (San Mateo)	11					11
PACHECO PASS SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara)			7			7
POTRERO HILLS LANDFILL (Solano)	49			3		52
ZANKER Material Processing Facility (Santa Clara)	80					80
ZANKER ROAD CLASS III LANDFILL (Santa Clara)	4					4
Totals (Tons)	64,618	11,229	115,899	12,923	37,504	242,173

Source: CIWMB Disposal Reporting System

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005

Agenda Item 19
Attachment 1

TABLE 10. SANTA CRUZ COUNTY 2002 GENERATION - DIVERSION - DISPOSAL

	GENERATION		DIVERSION		DISPOSAL		DIVERSION RATE
TOTALS (tons)							
County	211,693		108,679		103,014		51%
Santa Cruz	127,797		66,875		60,922		52%
Watsonville	129,872		93,775		36,097		72%
Scotts Valley	34,180		22,344		11,836		65%
Capitola	21,951		11,109		10,842		51%
Countywide	525,493		302,782		222,711		58%
Annual Per Person	tons	lbs	tons	lbs	tons	lbs	
County	1.58	3153	0.81	1618	0.77	1534	
Santa Cruz	2.31	4614	1.21	2414	1.10	2199	
Watsonville	2.73	5468	1.97	3948	0.76	1520	
Scotts Valley	2.95	5893	1.93	3852	1.02	2041	
Capitola	2.17	4347	1.10	2200	1.07	2147	
Countywide	2.03	4059	1.17	2339	0.86	1720	
Pounds Per Person Per Day (365)							
County		8.6		4.4		4.2	
Santa Cruz		12.6		6.6		6.0	
Watsonville		15.0		10.8		4.2	
Scotts Valley		16.1		10.6		5.6	
Capitola		11.9		6.0		5.9	
Countywide		11.1		6.4		4.7	

Source: CIWMB Diversion Rate Reports

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and Summary Plan (SP)

The County of Santa Cruz is responsible for administering the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan. Fulfillment of this responsibility is accomplished through the Santa Cruz Department of Public Works Recycling and Solid Waste Division. Funding for this activity comes from County Service Area 9C. There have been no changes in the funding source for administration of the CSE and SP.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The County of Santa Cruz is responsible for administering the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan. Fulfillment of this responsibility is accomplished through the Santa Cruz Department of Public Works Recycling and Solid Waste Division. There have been no changes in this administration of the CSE and SP.

Board Meeting
February 15-16, 2005

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented But Were Not

1. Progress of Program Implementation

a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

All program implementation information has been updated in the CIWMB Planning and Reporting Information System (PARIS), including the reason for not implementing programs, if applicable. In particular, the PARIS notes provide detail on the status of program progress for each jurisdiction.

b. Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE)

The City of Watsonville amended its NDFE in 2004 to reflect a new diversion facility. The County of Santa Cruz is preparing an amendment to its NDFE to reflect two existing and two new diversion facilities. These facilities include a Chipping & Grinding Operation at the Ben Lomond Transfer Station and at the Buena Vista Landfill (both existing), a C & D Recycling Operation at the Buena Vista Landfill and a Research Composting Operation at the Buena Vista Landfill for food waste composting. This amendment will go to the Local Task Force for review and comment the first week of February 2005. Other than this, there have been no changes in the use of non-disposal facilities.

c. Countywide Siting Element (CSE)

There have been no changes to the information provided in the current Countywide Siting Element.

d. Summary Plan (SP)

There have been no changes to the information provided in the current Summary Plan.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting Their Goals

The SRRE and HHWE programs are meeting their goals as evidenced by each jurisdiction in the county having exceeded the 50% disposal reduction mandate.

4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

There have been no changes in the availability of markets available to the jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County for their recyclable materials.

programs that were implemented, a statement as to whether programs are meeting their goals, and if not what contingency measures are being enacted to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code section 41751;

(F) changes in permitted disposal capacity, and quantities of waste disposed of in the county or regional agency;

(G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and

(H) changes in the implementation schedule.

(4) Within 90 days of receipt of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report, the Board shall review the county's or regional agency's findings, and at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's or regional agency's findings. Within 30 days of its action, the Board shall send a copy of its resolution, approving or disapproving the county's or regional agency's findings, to the LTF and the county or regional agency. If the Board has identified additional areas that require revision, the Board shall identify those areas in its resolution.

(b) CIWMP or RAIWMP Revision. If a revision is necessary the county or regional agency shall submit a CIWMP or RAIWMP revision schedule to the Board.

(1) The county or regional agency shall revise the CIWMP or RAIWMP in the areas noted as deficient in the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report and/or as identified by the Board.

(2) The county or regional agency shall revise and resubmit its CIWMP or RAIWMP pursuant to the requirements of sections 18780 through 18784 of this article.

(c) The county shall submit all revisions of its CIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised CIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

(d) The regional agency shall submit all revisions of its RAIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised RAIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

Note:

Authority:

Section 40502 of the Public Resources Code.

Reference:

Sections 40051, 40052, 41750, 41760, 41770, and 41822 of the Public Resources Code.